

9 November 1978

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Training

FROM: [REDACTED] Course Director
Intelligence Process Course

25X1A

SUBJECT: Course Report, Intelligence Process Course
No. 1-79, 10 October - 3 November 1978

The four-week, full-time Intelligence Process Course was held from 10 October to 3 November 1978. The course objectives were generally met without significant problems. The class was small, only 12 students, but student reaction and class attitude were good. There was a significant improvement in post-course test scores, and all students participated in the drafting of a class paper on the intelligence process. Three sources formed the data base for the paper--the collective experience of the class, the lectures, and the interviews. The class was divided into four interview teams of three people to facilitate a broader coverage. The instructor made appointments for student interviews. A list of offices interviewed is attached.

1. Student Participation

Class participation was initiated by a pre-course meeting four weeks before the course started. The students were advised that a class paper would be required and that there would be a pre-course and a post-course test. All students were at the meeting, and none objected to the paper or to the test. The class was divided into three writing teams of four people. Each team was to write the initial draft on their assigned segment of the intelligence process. Data gathering was accomplished during course lectures and discussions.

The class members maintained an excellent attitude and a high level of participation in the lecture question sessions, the interview sessions, and in preparing the class paper.

DOWNGRADE TO UNCLASSIFIED
UPON REMOVAL OF ATTACHMENTS

~~SECRET~~

Approved For Release 2000/04/18 : CIA-RDP80-00503A000100010001-9

SUBJECT: Course Report, Intelligence Process Course
No. 1-79, 10 October - 3 November 1978

2. Student Observations and Suggestions

25X1A The student critiques were handed in prior to
25X1A meetings with [REDACTED] National Foreign Assessment
Center (NFAC) and [REDACTED], National
Security Council (NSC). Most students mentioned that both
sessions were very valuable to them. What is perhaps most
significant about the critiques is that they do not mention
the class paper or the test. The National Security Agency
(NSA) tour which was put in at the students' request
received five negative remarks. The [REDACTED] tapes, the
Office of Central Reference (OCR) visit, and Professor [REDACTED]
25X1A [REDACTED] were among those sessions that received positive
25X1A comments.

3. Problems Encountered

Few problems were encountered. We did have a few
schedule changes which we were able to handle by switching
lecture time with time set aside for data gathering (inter-
viewing). Things were a bit hectic at times, especially
since this was a one-instructor course that was in session
during the OTR Conference. Lining up interviews for the
students at the last minute indicated that we needed to do
more planning for the selection of interviews during the
pre-course meeting.

4. Course Changes and Recommendations

The students each presented a half-hour briefing
on the part of the intelligence cycle in which they were
involved. They appeared to learn from and enjoy the
briefings and resultant discussions. Most ran over the
allotted 30 minutes. These should be retained and expanded
to 45 minutes.

The class paper provided both a mechanism for idea
development and examination as well as an incentive for
participation via questions in the lecture sessions. This
was an important part of the course in that it maintained a
constant overall goal. It is vital that there be an
appropriate recipient for the paper or else the paper will
be viewed as a "make-work" project.

An organizational diagram of CIA with the titles
removed below the Deputy Directorate level was included in
the pre- and post-course tests. This provided an incentive
to relate the individual speaker or subject within the
context of CIA. The students did well on the post-test. We
should consider using it in other courses. As a test, it
provides both an accountability mechanism and a learning
tool.

Approved For Release 2000/04/18 : CIA-RDP80-00503A000100010001-9

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

Approved For Release 2000/04/18 : CIA-RDP80-00503A000100010001-9

SUBJECT: Course Report, Intelligence Process Course
No. 1-79, 10 October - 3 November 1978

One student was from the Department of Energy (DOE). This was an added feature of the course which helped the students think a bit more about the Intelligence Community. In many of our courses, we should try to include, where possible, a few students from other parts of the Intelligence Community.

The pre-course meeting four weeks prior to beginning was very valuable in setting a receptive student attitude and in getting input in design, so that the course could be tailored to student needs. This session does require the Course Director to be open to suggestions, and to try to implement some of the changes suggested by the class. The NSA trip and the interviews in Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) are examples of student requests at the pre-course meeting. We should utilize 4-6 week advance pre-course meetings in other courses.

The overall lack of interest in the Intelligence Process Course, indicated by only 12 students, suggests that the course should be dropped. The changes discussed and recommended in this report should be considered in designing a basic Analysis Course to replace the Intelligence Process Course.

5. Course Composition

The average age, CIA employment, and grade was: 30 years, 3½ years, and GS-10. The composition was primarily DDS&T (7), but NFAC (3) and DDO (1) were represented. One student was from DOE.

25X1A

Attachments:

- 1 - Course Schedule (C)
- 2 - Course Roster (S)
- 3 - Course Test Copy (S)
- 4 - Pre- and Post-Course Test Diagrams (S)
- 5 - Interview List (U)
- 6 - Course Paper (S)
- 7 - Evaluations (U)

Approved For Release 2000/04/18 : CIA-RDP80-00503A000100010001-9

~~SECRET~~